

Draft

Has not been reviewed or accepted by the Board

CHAIRMAN: JAMES PATTERSON

MEMBERS: GEORGE AULEN, WILLIAM OLSEN, JESSE GALLO & KARL SCHEIBLE

Alternate: Kerry Boland

VILLAGE OF WARWICK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2019

The monthly meeting of the Village of Warwick Planning Board was held on Tuesday, October 8, 2019. Present were: Jim Patterson, Karl Scheible, Jesse Gallo, Bill Olsen, Kerry Boland, Village Engineer, Dave Getz and Planning Board attorney, Robert Dickover. Others present were: Susan Roth, Kirk Rother and others.

The Board recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Chairman acknowledged no correspondence received.

The Chairman acknowledged the resignation letter received by the Village Board from former Planning Board Chairman and member George Aulen.

A MOTION was made by Jesse Gallo, seconded by Karl Scheible and carried to accept the minutes of the August 13, 2019 Planning Board meeting. (5 Ayes)

Mr. Gallo mentioned that the Sept. minutes indicate 5 Ayes following motions when there should only be 4 Ayes.

The September 10, 2019 Planning Board minutes were amended to show 4 Ayes instead of 5.

A MOTION was made by Bill Olsen, seconded by Karl Scheible and carried to accept the minutes of the September 10, 2019 Planning Board meeting. (4 Ayes) {1 Abstention - Jesse Gallo}.

Mr. Rother - We went through the Scoping document and we believe it is all here for the Board to review. I think you are fairly familiar with the plan changes, most of the engineering is complete but I suspect one of the biggest interest in this new document is the traffic study. That was completely redone based on the new layout including the 25 additional potential homes in the Town of Warwick and just to summarize there are no changes in the level of service at any of the intersections.

Mr. Patterson - To be clear, we have only just received this and I have not had an opportunity to go through this. I know we received some comments from the engineer and our attorney but we will need some time so we are not ready to make any comments tonight.

Mr. Getz - A lot of the comments are minor in nature and they don't cause any changes in design or layout. I would like go to my comment on page 2, item 2 regarding wastewater. Within the last week or so I have met with the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Supervisor Mike Moser to discuss the impact of the project on the Robin Brae pump station. Under the current plan this project will tie into an existing sewerline which runs down Locust St. to Maple Ave. and by gravity to the Robin Brae pump station which is an old pump station that has been undersized for many years. There are 130 or so homes connected to it now and this would add about 45 more, so this could be a significant increase and because of the layout of the infrastructure at the bottom of Robin Brae along with the high ground water levels, etc. it is not feasible to do a quick and easy expansion of the existing pump station. The biggest issue right now is that there is a very shallow wet well and the way it functions is that during the day flows come in and when the level inside the well rises to a certain level the pump kicks on for a certain amount of time and kicks off. Because of the shallow wet well and the amount of flow coming in, the cycling is happening way too frequently or too many cycles per day for the good of the pumps and the maintenance of the system and the efficiency and all. JCO who operates the Village's systems has been pushing for years for the Village to look at some options to improve on the system. I met with Mr. Rother and we have discussed 4 possible improvements that theoretically could be made to the system to help mitigate the impact of this project 1) A replacement pump station with a larger wet well adjacent to the existing pump station on Robin Brae (under this scenario the existing pump station would be abandoned) 2) Eliminating the Robin Brae pump station by constructing a new gravity system from Robin Brae to the existing sewer system on Colonial Ave. and that would involve new gravity lines through private property along with wetlands and stream. It is complicated but in terms of elevation theoretically it could be done. 3) Replace sewer lines along Maple Ave. so that the flows from Village View and other sources could bypass the Robin Brae pump station. Right now all of Locust St. and Woodside and that area flows by gravity down to Maple Ave./17A to and heads towards the Village and into Robin Brae. The manhole and pipe elevations do not allow it to continue south along 17A but if those could be redone at deeper elevations and with enough money, theoretically, that is a way that you could by-pass the Robin Brae pump station.

The pump station would still be needed for a few homes perhaps that are on that street but it would certainly eliminate most of the flow that goes to Robin Brae. That would also involve getting State DOT permits. 4) Constructing a new pump station on or near the bottom of the Village View site and from that pump station discharge to the existing sewer line up the road on Woodside, past the high point so that would flow down Woodside towards Grand St. and by-pass Locust St. in that scenario. These are potential projects that could be done. We don't know which one would be the most beneficial, cost effect or feasible. We are asking the applicant to help us look into that. We are not looking for them to design something in detail but just to help the Board evaluate some possibilities.

Ms. Roth - If you want something in the EIS I understand but this is highly technical and I think that Mr. Getz and Mr. Rother will have to do this.

Mr. Rother - My understanding with this after speaking with Dave is that 1) this is not something that Village View will undertake, it is just possible scenarios that Village View in coordination with the Village could explore to mitigate existing issues and the possible exasperation of those issues because of the flows from Village View. I think it will just be kind of a conceptual desk top study of the options.

Mr. Getz - Yes.

Mr. Rother - As far as a dollar and cents analysis I don't know how we could do the scenario with the private property, it just seems like such an open ended thing but we could see what the obstacles would be and discuss it in the EIS.

Mr. Olsen - Would these upgrades to Robin Brae have to be done before construction on Village View?

Mr. Getz - I don't think it is an absolute necessity, it is something that I can't answer definitively yet. We have approved other projects in that part of Town without saying that the pump station needed to be changed.

Mr. Rother - This came up with the original 28 lot subdivision and I believe in that Finding Statement the loose terminology that was used was that Village View would be willing to make a fair share contribution to whatever improvements are needed to that pump station.

Ms. Roth - I am just saying that this needs to be a conceptual study.

Mr. Getz - That is right.

Mr. Patterson - Who determines what works or what is eliminated?

Mr. Rother - I agreed to discuss all 4 options in the SEIS.

Mr. Getz - I have given him some background data, elevations, flows...

Mr. Rother - Some mapping and I think I will get some people out to shoot some additional elevations on sewer and then we will present it.

Mr. Getz - I think it is up to us and other Village representatives to take a look and it might be easy to knock out a couple with cost efficiency.

Ms. Roth - When you are addressing this you may also want to address the timeline of implementing these solutions as well.

Mr. Patterson - That would be considerate. I spoke with Mr. Getz earlier this week as well about a question I wanted to present tonight. This Board has been asked to compare the 28 lot subdivision to the 42 lot and when we drive past it or walk it there is nothing there so I wanted to be able to compare what it there now versus the 42 lot. Mr. Getz's response was...

Mr. Getz - The original DEIS does present that comparison and the SEIS was more a comparison between the previous and current plans.

Mr. Patterson - We have all of the information all together, we just have to try and compare them all.

Mr. Getz - Yes but the traffic study includes that no-build compared to the current project.

Ms. Roth - Yes.

Mr. Rother - Traffic studies will always project out anticipated date of completion. Any traffic study for any project will analysis traffic conditions at that date for a no-build condition and the build condition and it is also supposed to include other pending approved projects in the area as provided to us by the Board. In this latest study we included the potential development for the Town of Warwick parcel, the 25 lots.

Mr. Patterson - What size are the lots in the Town?

Mr. Rother - We would do a cluster subdivision so those lots would probably be 1 to 1.5 acres per lot. with at least 50% of that property left for open space. But the density is based on 1 dwelling unit per 3 acres.

Mr. Dickover - We have received the SEIS, we have not formally accepted it as the final SEIS, the time for that has been extended till the Board determines whether it is acceptable for public dissemination. When that announcement is made the Board will need to decide and probably schedule at the same time a public hearing on the Alternative Reduced Scale Subdivision and for the SEIS. We did receive a letter from the Town Planning Board reminding us that they are an involved agency in this process and requested a copy of this SEIS. The Board does not have to do that but I certainly recommend it.

Mr. Patterson - Do we send it prior to accepting it?

Mr. Dickover - Yes.

Mr. Getz - Will there be a new date on the corrections?

Ms. Roth - I will be a new date on pages that were changed.

Mr. Rother - Do you want a revision date?

Mr. Getz - Yes.

Mr. Patterson - You mentioned freeboard, what is freeboard?

Mr. Getz - It is the difference in elevation from the top of the water surface to the top of wherever it will overflow.

Mr. Gallo - I count 32 lots not 33.

Mr. Rother - The one that has the five 2 families on it would be the 33rd lot.

Mr. Gallo - It looks like you are missing lot 16.

Mr. Rother - I will have to double check that.

A MOTION was made by Jesse Gallo, seconded by Karl Scheible and carried to adjourn the meeting. (5 Ayes)

Respectfully submitted;

Maureen J. Evans,
Planning Board secretary